224

ان الدين عند الله الاسلام

The Review of Religions

Edited by GHULAM FARID MALIK, M. A.

Vol. XXXI JULY, 1932 No. 7

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

CONTENTS

	Pages
HUMANITY'S GREATEST BENEFACTOR—MUHAMMAD	223
ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOGMA OF THE TRINITY	233
ZIONISM—A New Eastern Problem —A. M. Rihbani	240
THE PROPHET'S MATRIMONIAL CONNECTIONS	247
COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DATES IN WORLD HISTORY	254
NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN	259
NOTES AND COMMENTS	267

Prohibition in America—Christian Testimony to the Catholicity of Islam—Modern Persia—What ails Modern Civilization—India in British Parliament—A Plea for Separate Electorates—How the Moors were expelled from Spain—Concessions.

Head Office :
QADIAN,
Punjab : India.

Branch Office :
THE LONDON MOSQUE,
63, Melrose Road, Southfields, London, S. W. 18.

IF . . .

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

YOU WANT TO KNOW

What Islam Stands for, what is its message for humanity, how does it seek to raise man from the lowest depths of degradation to the highest pinnacles of glory—economically, morally and spiritually

READ

AHMADIYYAT OR THE TRUE ISLAM

BY

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad

HEAD OF THE AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY AND THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORITY ON ISLAM

The book deals in a simple and lucid manner, briefly but fully and completely, with all the different aspects of the teachings of Islam.

BOOK DEPOT, QADIAN, Pb., India

225

The
Review of Religions

Vol. XXXI JULY, 1932 No. 7

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

In the name of Allah, the most Beneficent and the most Merciful
We praise Him and invoke His blessings upon
His exalted Prophet.

" A prophet came unto the world and the world accepted him not, but God shall accept him and establish his truth with mighty signs."

HUMANITY'S GREATEST BENEFACTOR—MUHAMMAD

[Under this heading we propose to deal at some length with the Holy Prophet's benevolent and kind acts, his sanctity and his sacrifices. The present article deals with his sacrifices.—*Ed.*]

Before we attempt to give a brief description of the sacrifices of the Holy Prophet, it seems necessary and useful to say a few words to explain as to what constitutes sacrifice and what is its nature and character. Without these introductory remarks it is difficult to realize, even incompletely and imperfectly, by what noble and beautiful spirit of self-abnegation and selflessness all the Prophet's public and private acts were inspired and how grand were the sacrifices that he deliberately and willingly underwent for the moral and spiritual welfare of the world.

True Definition of Sacrifice

It is not difficult to understand that the forcible deprivation of a person of his possessions and belongings

can not be called sacrifice. Real and genuine sacrifice consists in the giving up of a highly valued thing knowingly and cheerfully for the good and benefit of others.

Thousands of people die every day but nobody can say that they *sacrifice* their lives and as many leave their homes and hearths daily but their separation from their wives and children is not regarded as sacrifice. Because death comes unawares and uninvited and those who leave their countries and relatives do not do so for the sake of public weal but to further and advance their own private and personal ends and objects. If we seriously ponder over the sacrifices of the Holy Prophet (peace and the blessings of God be upon him) we will at once find that he bore them of his own free will and accord and for the sake and in the interest of others.

Kinds of Sacrifice

Genuine and true sacrifice is of several kinds—temporary and permanent. The latter is far superior to, and nobler than, the former. The Prophet's sacrifices belonged to the latter category. He is said to have always laid the greatest stress on the perpetuation of a good deed once started.

These two kinds of sacrifices are again divided into two sub-heads. In the first category come those sacrifices that are exacted from a person; in the latter those that a person undergoes prompted by an inward urge without having been subjected to any external influences. To explain the nature of the first class of sacrifices the example may be cited of a person who is harassed and compelled to give up a principle and he refuses to do so. This sort of sacrifice may be called compulsory or enforced sacrifice. The other kind of sacrifice is that a person spends his money, without any outside pressure having been brought to bear upon him, for the good and welfare of the public. This kind of sacrifice may be called a self-imposed sacrifice. The

sacrifices of the Holy Prophet comprised both these kinds. He was harried, harassed and severely persecuted to give up a mission with which God had entrusted him and he refused to do so knowing fully well the dire consequences that his refusal would entail and he gladly and cheerfully put up with the privations and hardships to which he and his followers were most callously subjected. He could, if he would, save himself and his companions from those indescribable sufferings but he would not. Our Noble Master, therefore, evidently underwent many sacrifices without being compelled to do so.

Enforced and Self-Imposed Sacrifices

These two kinds of sacrifices are again divided into two more sub-heads. (1) *Istikrahi i.e.*, a sacrifice which a person makes under the pressure of circumstances, his heart in the meanwhile refusing to do what he has to do: (2) *Rizaee, viz.*, a sacrifice that a person makes compelled by the pressure of circumstances but at the same time he relishes the act of sacrifice he is performing. To illustrate the first kind of sacrifice may be cited the example of fighting. Good and God-fearing persons abhor to indulge in fighting but very often, quite against their inclination and intention, they have to take part in wars for the sake of common good. Death in the service of a national cause explains the second kind of sacrifice. A person is killed by others but he welcomes such death. This kind of sacrifice may be called a compulsory sacrifice because his death has been brought about by others but it can be equally called an optional sacrifice because he invites and welcomes such a death. The Prophet's sacrifices were multifarious and multitudineous. He did things which he personally did not like to do but he did them in the interest of general good, thus sacrificing his own inclination and preference. His taking part, for instance, in fights against those who wished to exterminate Islam comes under this category. And he underwent sacrifices which he personally

liked to undergo. The spending of his money in the way of God and the sacrifice of his comfort may be included in this class.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Then again there are sacrifices of which the effect is temporary and they are made to serve an ephemeral and transitory end. There are others which are of a more permanent nature and the sphere of whose influence is very large. The sacrifices that come in the later category are naturally of a higher order, because they are above the considerations of personal gains and aggrandizement. The Prophet's sacrifices, as we shall shortly show, belonged to this latter class. They were not of an ephemeral nature, made to serve or achieve a temporary end, but were made for the abiding and permanent welfare of humanity. What on account of the spotless purity of the motives that inspired them and the loftiness of the purpose they were intended to serve and what on account of the extensiveness of their scope and the variety of their nature they were simply amazing and set a noble example for the coming generations of humanity to follow. He not only himself, out of his own accord, quite willingly, deliberately and delightfully underwent all sorts of sacrifices for the moral and spiritual welfare and well-being of mankind but also exhorted and enjoined his followers to do the same so that the world should increasingly continue to make spiritual progress and the standard of human morality should continue to rise. He is commanded by God to say:—

> "We shall most certainly disclose the perfection of your faith in this way that you will be made to go through conditions in which you shall have to face fear and hunger and shall have to put up with the loss of property and lives and fruits. Those who will gladly and cheerfully endure all these hardships and sufferings and will say that the things bestowed upon them by God have been well spent in His way, to them give good news that their sacrifices have not been vainly borne."

Sacrifices, as explained above, are of many kinds. Each sacrifice, in turn, is branched into many sections and

divisions, as for instance (*a*) the sacrifice of physical desires, *i.e.*, to suppress them altogether, (*b*) the sacrifice of passions, ambitions and aspirations *i. e.*, to kill them. (*c*) sacrifice of money (*d*) sacrifice of one's country or home *i.e.*, to give it up. (*e*) sacrifice of friends (*f*) sacrifice of relatives *i. e.*, to give them up for the sake of God (*g*) sacrifice of honour *i. e*, to suffer all manner of indignities and dishonour for the sake of truth or to give up chances of acquiring wealth and honour (*h*) sacrifice of comfort and convenience (*i*) sacrifice of luxury (*j*) sacrifice of the generations yet to be born (*k*) sacrifice of the feelings and susceptibilities of relatives (*l*) sacrifice of life (*m*) sacrifice of the susceptibilities of friends, etc., etc.

We will briefly describe that the Holy Prophet (peace and the blessings of God be upon him) gladly bore all these different kinds of sacrifices.

Sacrifice of Physical Desires

The sacrifice of his physical desires can easily be proved from his marriage, in the prime of his life, with a lady of very advanced age. The reason, as is evident from the account of his life, for doing so was that he wished that his wife should not engross too much of his attention and that he should be left free to devote as much time as possible towards the improvement and amelioration of the moral and social condition of his countrymen. At the time of his first marriage, he was not yet entrusted with his great and sublime mission and there was no circle of admirers who were affectionately attached to him. He knew that, situated as he was, if he married a young girl she would demand too much of his time and attention. To avoid this he married a lady of mature age and this was indeed a great sacrifice on his part. He was then in the full bloom of his youth, only 25 years old and the state of his physical health was such that at the advanced age of 63 there were to be found very few grey hair in his beard and head and he was strong enough to

lead all the five daily prayers and actually led in person all his expeditions. A man who was so hale and hearty in his old age marries in the spring of his life a woman of very mature age. Could sacrifice of the desires of the flesh go further ?

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

In the prime of his life he married a woman who was much older than him so that she should not occupy much of his precious time. But when he himself became advanced in years and found that there had come into being a community of women who were reverentially attached to him and were ready to bear all sorts of sacrifices with him and who sought his continuous guidance in spiritual and religious affairs, for their welfare and guidance and in order to teach them the injunctions, ordinances and principles of religion, he married several young ladies and willingly bore a burden in his old age which was sufficient to break the back of young men in their youth. In short, in his youth and in his mature age he sacrificed his physical passions.

On not a few occasions he sacrificed his personal feelings. In this connection may be cited that famous historical incident which throws a flood of light on his uprightness, fairness and impartiality.

Sacrifice of Personal Feelings

Abbas, his uncle, was arrested in the battle of Badr. He was a Muslim at heart. He had helped the Prophet on many occasions and used to keep the Holy Prophet informed of the activities and schemes and plans of the Quresh. Being very much pressed by the Quresh he had, much against his wish, joined with them in the battle of Badr. When arrested he was bound with ropes in the same manner as all other captives were bound. As the number of the Mulims at the time was very small and the means at their disposal were not such as to secure the prisoners against absconding, the latter were bound very effectively,

the result being that Abbas who was brought up in very affluent circumstances and was a well-to-do person could not bear the pain the tightening of the ropes gave him and began to groan. On hearing his groans the Prophet was naturally very much distressed and was perceived tossing in his bed—a sure sign of mental perturbation. The Muslims realizing that the Prophet's distress was due to the groaning of Abbas relaxed the ropes with which he was bound. When after a short time he did not hear Abbas's groans he enquired of the cause of it. He was told that in deference to his uneasiness and anxiety for Abbas they had loosened his strings. "Either loosen the strings of all the captives or tighten the strings with which Abbas is bound," said the Prophet. To what supreme heights man can rise in the sacrifice of his personal feelings! This is indeed a marvellous sacrifice. Abbas was the Prophet's uncle and a very loving uncle indeed. But he would not have his strings relaxed unless the strings of all the other prisoners were also relaxed. He knew that just as the distress of Abbas distressed him, among the captives were the relatives of many of his companions whose state of mind was analogous to his; so he would not allow justice and fairness to be compromised. Abbas was given a relief only when all other prisoners had shared that relief with him.

Prophet's Steadfastness of Purpose and his Humaneness

Another similar instance may be quoted in this connection. The Meccans once went in a deputation to his uncle, Abu Talib and complained that the Prophet's fulminations against their idols had exceeded all bounds and requested him to wean him from his ways. They added, however, that his nephew was at liberty to preach the unity of God but he had no business to declare their idols and gods as false and powerless. "If you will not," they said, "make him realize the error of his ways and stop him from his course we shall be constrained to oppose you as well."

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah
That was indeed a very critical moment for Abu Talib. He sent for the Holy Prophet (peace and the blessings of God be upon him). He naturally thought that as the Prophet was under a deep debt of gratitude to him he would not reject his advice. He told him that the Meccans were very much enraged against him (the Prophet) and were threatening that in the event of his not altering his attitude towards their gods they would extend the persecution to him (Abu Talib) and to all his other relatives. "Would you not," said Abu Talib to the Holy Prophet, "desist from preaching against, at least, the idols and gods of the Meccans and spare us much unnecessary trouble". To what extent the feelings of the Holy Prophet were wounded by his being obliged to refuse perhaps the first and the last, request of one who had brought him up from his childhood, who was his uncle and benefactor and protector and who had made to him that request under duress and after much anxious consideration, can only be imagined than described. The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was deeply grieved at his inability to accede to the request of Abu-Talib. He realized the awkwardness of his situation. He was literally on the horns of a dilemma. Two conflicting demands were made on his fidelity and faithfulness. On one side was the earnest and pathetic request of his uncle of which the refusal would have entailed the loss of many of his dear relatives and benefactors and on the other was the sacred mission with which he had been entrusted by God, and to the spreading and preaching of which he had dedicated his whole life. He did not know how to reconcile these two conflicting and contradictory demands. He was deeply touched. Tears welled up in his eyes. "Uncle dear" he at last said, "I can bear all sorts of privations, distresses, troubles, persecutions for your sake, I could even lay down my life at your bidding. But one thing I cannot give up even at your beseeching. I must not cease preaching the Unity of God and the helplessness and powerlessness of the gods and goddesses of the Quresh and the iniquity and abomination of setting up equals with Him. You may leave me to my fate and at the mercy of my

enemies and persecutors." The Prophet's flat and unequivocal refusal was sufficient to stagger any man, especially one to whom he was greatly indebted. But Abu Talib knew him and had studied his character too much to become offended. He knew how highly the Prophet was grateful to him for his many kindnesses to him. He knew as well that the Prophet was really writhed with anguish to have to refuse his request and that the demands of a nobler and more sacred cause were only responsible for that refusal and that that refusal was based on a consideration of the spiritual welfare and good of his people in particular and of the whole of humanity at large. Instead of becoming offended at the rejection of his request, he was deeply touched with the Prophet's answer and said in a voice full of pathos, "My nephew, go and carry on your noble task, whatever you say is true. I and my relatives are with you and will ever remain with you and will be ready to bear any persecution for your sake." The sacrifice of the feelings and emotions of relatives is harder to bear than the sacrifice of one's own feelings. We can stifle and smother our own feelings but we always try to fulfil the desires and respect the susceptibilities of our relations. Do you not see that parents provide better food and clothing to their chrildren at the cost of their own comfort? A study of the life of the Holy Prophet shows unmistakably that not only he had inflicted a perpetual death on his own feelings and emotions for the sake of the cause of eternal truth and the well-being of mankind but had not hesitated to sacrifice also the susceptibilities of his relatives for ever. A beautiful incident reveals this noble trait of the Prophet's noble character. In one of the battles in which the Muslims achieved a great victory, many captives and a large amount of booty fell into their hands. The condition of the Muslims, as the result of the victory, improved considerably. The Prophet's daughter, Fatima, seeing that all the Muslims had their due share of the booty asked him to give her a slave girl as on account of the great amount of the manual work she had to do, her hands had

become swollen with blisters. To this request the Prophet answered that the blistered condition of her hands was better than that she should get anything of the booty. "Rest content," he said to Fatima, "with your present lot, because this condition is more calculated to win God's pleasure." The Prophet was entitled to his share in the booty which he could legitimately claim and get. But seeing that the increasing wants of the Muslims were not fully satisfied, he did not take anything from it nor did he give anything to his daughter inspite of her very pressing and genuine need. This is how he used to sacrifice the wants of his very near relatives. How he never allowed the feelings of his wives to stand in the way of the discharge of his duties and the carrying out of his mission has already been described.

CONCESSIONS

The annual subscription of the *Review of Religions* has been reduced from Rs. 5 to Rs. 4 only and its size has been increased by about 24 pages. In view of these concessions we hope our friends would lose no time to become its subscribers.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOGMA OF THE TRINITY—I

* The first of all the commandments is Hear, O Israel,
The Lord our God is one Lord—(mark 12 : 29.)

The spread of light and learning, of new and more developed ideas and improved conceptions of moral values, the scientific and geographical inventions and discoveries that have been made in such large numbers in the first quarter of the present century have completely shattered that complacent satisfaction, composure and serenity of mind in regard to religious beliefs and doctrines which were the characteristic features of the Christians of Europe and America in the 18th and even up to the seventies of the last century. They had not then developed that inquiring state of mind, that questioning mood which have now rudely shaken the enitre edifice of the Christian Faith to its foundations. Its cardinal doctrines and fundamental beliefs have been tested and found wanting. The leaders of political and even religious thought in the West have dubbed them as the relics of a primitive mentality and long out-grown paganism. Writers of eminence have jeered and scoffed at them. Sir Oliver Lodge, Dean Inge, the Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Bertrand Russell, Messrs. H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw and Hugh Walpole are only a few of a large galaxy of renowned literary men, philosophers, scientists and religious leaders who have not hesitated to spurn and reject all or most of those religious principles and dogmas in which the agonized souls and perturbed consciences of their fathers and grandfathers sought refuge. The Atonement and the Trinity are the pivots round which the whole system of Christian theology revolves and you will hardly find one intelligent person in the West who believes in these dogmas as they were believed in by Gregory, Augustine, Luther, Latimer, Cranmer and Ridley. Belief

in the Immaculate Conception, the Infallibility of the Bible and in the physical Resurrection of Jesus has also been severely questioned and criticised. The Biblical conception of Hell has been found to be so repugnant and revolting to commonsense and intelligence that its very existence has been altogether denied. In fact there is hardly a single doctrine and principle of Christianity which Christendom has not practically given up. But it is the belief in the God-head of Jesus which of all Christian beliefs has been most severely and unsparingly attacked. To believe that a man in whom there was nothing above an ordinary human being was God or an equal of God or a partner in God-head is indeed an insult to the plainest human intelligence and reason. The story of Jesus' life as narrated in the Bible shows him to be so weak and helpless that it seems singularly surprising how the belief at all came to gain ground among his followers that he was God-Incarnate or the Son of God and that such an utterly foolish and manifestly indefensible doctrine continued to be believed in with zeal and fervency is simply incomprehensible. It shows how credulous man is and how a person of superior intellect, as Paul evidently was as compared with the other early followers of Jesus Christ, can impose his own philosophy and ideas on the people among whom he is born, bred and has his being and through them on subsequent generations and thus leave his indelible imprint on the whole course of human history. The recent theological research in the sources of the Christian dogmas and doctrines has shown them to be the remnants of old paganism. There is really nothing in the life and sayings of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels to which may reasonably be ascribed the belief in his God-head. This is why, perhaps, this dogma has been rejected in the West with the same vehemence with which it was once believed and the most refreshing thing about it is, that the revolt against it first of all started in quarters which were at one time its most zealous, even unquestioning, supporters. The belief which is now gradually gaining ground in ecclesiastical

circles in Europe and America and to which the Christian masses are giving increasing allegience is "Jesus did not claim in the Gospels to be the son of God in a physical sense, such as the narratives of virgin birth suggest, nor did he claim to be the son of God in a metaphysical sense, such as was required by the Nicene theology. He claimed to be God's son in a normal sense, in the sense in which all human beings are sons of God, as standing in a filial and moral relationship to God and capable of acting on those moral principels on which God acts." The credit for promulgating this view which is the only sane and right view about Jesus Christ, in fact, about any religious reformer, and which has now become fashionable in northern Europe to entertain, goes to Professor Adolf Harnack and Ernest Renan. Both these distinguished sons of the Church raised the standard of revolt against its very widely believed doctrines at a time when the slightest divergence from the accepted view was instantly punished with excommunication and social ostracism. In fact these two gentlemen of sound learning and independent thinking in conjunction with may others in Europe and America had simply prepared the ground for a World-Teacher at whose hands Christianity was destined to receive its final death-blow. A Messiah was yet in the making when these sporadic revolts were taking place in Christian countries against doctrines and tenets which had been believed in for 2,000 years. That Messiah was to bring the erring flock of the first Messiah back to the Master's fold.

To revert to our subject, Professor Harnack in his book "What is Christianity," says regarding the belief in the divinity of Jesus :—

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

> "In the second place he (Jesus) described the Lord of heaven and earth as his God and his father; as the Creator, and as Him who is alone God. He is certain that everything which he has and everything which he is to accomplish comes from this Father. He prays to Him, he subjects himself to His will; he struggles hard to find out what it is and to fulfil it. Aim, strength, understanding,

the issue, and the hard **must** all come from the Father. This is what the Gospels say, and it cannot be turned and twisted. This feeling, praying, working, struggling and suffering individual is a man who in the face of his God also associates himself with other men."

Again he says :

"Let us first of all consider the designation, "Son of God". Jesus in one of his discourses made it specially clear why and in what sense he gave himself this name. The saying is to be found in Mathew, and not, as might perhaps have been expected, in John: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." It is 'knowledge of God' that makes the sphere of the Divine Sonship. It is in this knowledge that he came to know the sacred Being who rules heaven and earth as Father, as *his* Father. The consciousness which he possesses of being the Son of God is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequeuce of knowing God as the Father and as his Father. Rightly understood, the name of son means nothing but the knowledge of God."

Jesus founded no religion. He brought no new dispensation, he gave no sacrament. The present institutional Christianity was a later growth. Professor Harnack explains this aspect of the Christian faith at the same time shedding more light on the implications and significance of the Biblical epithet, "son of God". He says :

"Jesus directed men's attention to great questions; he promised them God's grace and mercy ; he required them to decide whether they would have God or Mamon, an eternal or an earthly life, the soul or the body, humility or self-righteousness, love or selfishness, the truth or a lie. The sphere which these questions occupy is all-embracing; the individual is called upon to listen to the glad message of mercy and the Fatherhood of God, and to make up his mind whether he will be on God's side and the Eternal's, or on the side of the world and the time. The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, *has to do with the Father only and not with the Son.* This is no paradox, nor on the other hand, is it rationalism, but the simple expression of the actual fact as the evangelists give it."

This inference drawn from the Gospels by Professor Harnack about the manhood of Jesus was seconded, supported and reinforced by Ernest Renan, a scholar of acknowledged eminence and undisputed authority and a Christian of honest but independent views. Renan says on the same question :—

> "That Jesus never dreamt of making himself pass for an incarnation of God, is a matter about which there can be no doubt. Such an idea was entirely foreign to Jewish mind, and there is no trace of it in the synoptical gospels we only find it indicated in portions of the gospel of John, which cannot be accepted as expressing the thoughts of Jesus. Sometimes Jesus even seems to take precautions to put down such a doctrine (Math. XIX : 17, Mark X : 18, Luke XVIII : 19). The *accusation* that he made himself God, or the equal of God, is presented, even in the gospel of John, as a calumny of the Jews (John V : 18). In this last gospel he declares himself less than his Father (John XIV : 28). Elsewhere he avows that the Father has not revealed anything to him (Mark X : 35—40). He believes himself to be more than an ordinary man, but separated from God by an infinite distance. He is son of God, but all men are, or may become so, in diverse degrees (Math. V : 9 and 45, Luke III : 38, VI : 35, XX : 36). Every one ought daily to call God his father ; all who are raised again will be sons of God (Luke XX : 36). The divine sonship was attributed in the Old Testament to beings who it was by no means pretended were equal with God. The word "Son" has the widest meanings in the semitic language and in that of the New Testament. Besides, the idea Jesus had of man, was not that low idea which a cold Deism has introduced. In his poetic concep tion of nature, one breath alone penetrates the universe, the breath of man is that of God ; God dwells in man, and lives by man, the same as man dwells in God, and lives by God.

We have always been of the opinion that the words "son of God" used in the Bible about Jesus have no other significance than that Jesus loved God as men love their fathers and God loved Jesus as fathers love their sons. The relation of God with Jesus was similar to His relation with His other Messengers and chosen servants. This appellation of the "son of God" is given in the Bible to many prophets and other godly and righteous persons. It is

really very strange that when the words "Son of God" or similar other metaphorical phrases are spoken in regard to other prophets in the Bible, they remain men nevertheless and do not for that reason partake of Divinity, but when the same metaphors or words purporting to imply even an inferior status are used about Jesus or are only supposed to have been used about him, it being a matter of dispute whether they actually apply to him or to some one else, he becomes at once elevated to the position of the Supreme Being. If gods can be made in this arbitrary fashion, the list of gods, instead of being limited to three, would inevitably swell to an unlimited extent and the number of the gods of the Christians would by far exceed the 300 million deities of the Hindus whom they look down upon as polytheists and infidels.

In support of our contention we quote J. Middleton Murray whose "Life of Jesus", created not a small stir in the religious circles in England only five or six years ago. He says:—

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

> "Very few of the millions who in some sort or other have believed in Jesus, have believed in his message; very few have cared to understand it. To most of those who would have cared, the way to understanding has been barred by their belief in Jesus as God, as the Son of God in some peculiar and transcendental sense. This he was not, nor ever claimed to be. He believed he was the son of God in precisely the same sense as he believed all men to be sons of God. The difference between him and other men, in his eyes, was simply this: that he knew that he was the son of God while they did not. Therefore he was God's first-born, or first-reborn, son. But even that had no part in his message. His wonderful news was this: that all men were God's sons, if they would but become his sons, and that he was sent to show them the way. That was the strange and simple message of Jesus, the 'wonderful news' that he went to proclaim through Galilee."

We have preferred to give no argument to prove that Jesus was neither God nor the son of God in the physical sense as the fact that he was born and lived and died like

ordinary men stands as an invincible rock against all false and foolish assumptions that he was God on this or that ground. We have confined ourselves to quoting the Bible and the leaders of Christian thought in support of our view that Jesus possessed no special prerogatives to be regarded as a partner in Divinity in preference to other Prophets and Messengers of God. Our present article is only an introduction to a subsequent article which will appear in our next issue and in which an attempt will be made to show from original historical sources how this belief originated and developed among the Christians, also that not Jesus but some one else was responsible for it.

ZIONISM—A NEW EASTERN PROBLEM

(BY A. M. RIHBANI.)

The present contention between the people of Palestine and the Zionists is one of the most deplorable aspects of the troubled life of the Holy Land; and if the political programme of Zionism is finally carried out, the event may be counted one of the saddest tragedies in the history of Palestine and in the history of the Jews.

When one thinks of the many centuries—from the time of the Arabian conquest of Palestine to the World War—during which the Jews and the non-Jews of that country lived at peace with one another, one is dismayed to realize that the recent intrusion of alien forces has stirred such enmities in Palestine, whose fire seems to be unquenchable. The non-Jews, who for these many centuries have been in the majority, had always looked upon the Jewish minority as neighbours and fellow-subjects of the ruling power. The quarrels between the Jews and the non-Jews never had been of greater intensity than those which often occur between the various sects, or the various clans of the same faith, in Eastern countries. The Jews of Palestine have never had to undergo such persecutions as many of their co-religionists have suffered in certain parts of Europe. No pogroms have ever taken place in the Holy Land.

The Zionists, also, who had been coming into Palestine for years previous to the War, were left absolutely unmolested. More than thirty years ago I used to hear in my Lebanon home of Zionist immigration to the Holy Land. So far as I remember, those immigrants were looked upon by the people of the country as peaceful,

industrious Jews who had come in as home-seekers, with no political designs whatever. The Moslems, even though they were under a ruler of their own faith who was bound by the Koran to protect them at whatever cost, never demanded from the Sultan the expulsion of the Zionists. More than thirty Zionist colonies existed in Palestine before the War, which the non-Jews considered as legitimate enterprises. The only thing which I remember used to be said about those Zionists was that they did not seem overly scrupulous in regarding the rights of their non-Jewish neighbours; but even then it was thought that time would correct such a defect. The Zionists might have continued to come into Palestine as home-seekers and as industrial workers, unopposed, but for the recent political programme of Zionism whose working-out would mean the ultimate subjugation by the Zionists of the non-Jewish elements.

So the revolt of the people of Palestine against Zionism, as may readily be seen, is neither racial nor religious. It is an instinctive reaction against an invasion which threatens their social and political existence. Self-preservation is their driving motive. It is not an uprising against the Zionists simply because they are Jews. I am very certain that if the Armenians, for an example, were to come into Palestine with the purpose of making of it an Armenian State, the resistance of the Palestinians to them would be no less determined. The case is elementary. When a problem arising out of the necessities of a country's own life confronts its people, they accept it and deal with it calmly as a natural difficulty. But when a problem is forced upon an unoffending country by a superior power, the people of that country are bound to look upon it, to use a Biblical phrase, as an accursed thing to which no community can honourably reconcile itself.

Political Zionism is being forced upon Palestine by a group of Zionist idealists, backed up by British military

Power. The offence is utterly unprovoked. The leaders of this movement have chosen to carry on an experiment in colonization at the expense of the present owners of Palestine, and the British Government is supporting the enterprise for a purpose of its own vitally related to Great Britain's intricate policy in the East. This problem needs to be studied with perfect freedom from religious and racial prejudice. It is a political problem, and the cry of the people of Palestine against it is for justice and fair-play. Let us therefore face the facts.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

It is very well known to students of history how, first, in the Kitchener Agreement with King Housein, Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the Arab countries, of which Palestine is an integral part, and, second, in 1918, in a joint declaration the British and the French solemnly promised to guarantee to those Eastern countries "the establishment of goverments and administrations *deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the native population.*" The people of Palestine, like their fellow-Syrians, hailed these declarations as the charter of their freedom and gave the British arms in the Eastern campaign all possible support. Palestine, as the students of history know, is a province of Syria to which it was annexed by the Romans shortly before the Christian era. The expectation was that after the War Syria would become a federation of autonomous provinces of which Palestine, of course, would be a member.

Now, it can easily be imagined with what dismay the people of Syria in general and of Palestine in particular received the Balfour Declaration promising Palestine to the Zionists together with British aid to enable them to establish in that land a Jewish state. When during the War the Arab army and afflicted Syria were engaged in facilitating General Allenby's advance against the Turks, the Zionists were busy perfecting their designs against Palestine. They virtually held up the

British Government at a most critical time in the War and succeeded in making their cause seem the desire of the fourteen million Jews in the world. The British Government, in a most unwarrantable manner and contrary to the letter and spirit of its treaty with the Arabs, and its later declaration to the people of the "Eastern countries," concluded agreements with the Zionists most detrimental to the people of Palestine, without ever permitting them to be heard in their own behalf. The first thing they know was that Palestine was abitrarily detached from Syria and practically handed over to the Zionists.

Whatever the necessities of the War and their future designs in the East may have led the British Government cautiously to promise the Zionists, to the latter Palestine seemed a defenceless prey.

Quite unjustly the people of the country are being practically prevented from exercising their governmental functions until a Zionist majority has been imported from every country of disorganized and Bolshevik Eastern Europe. The present population of Palestine numbers about 700,000, only 70,000 of whom are Jews, and many of these are opposed to Zionism. If Palestine is to be detached from Syria and made a sovereign state, according to what code of justice are its people denied the right to say how their country shall be governed and whether it really belongs to them or to a people which is yet to be imported into it?

The claim by the Zionists of the right to possess Palestine, because in the remote past their ancestors owned it, is a very novel one. According to such logic the Finns might claim Russia; and Arabs, Spain; the Danes, England; and the Indians, America.

Again, the present great shrines of the Holy Land are Christian and Mohammedan, and not Jewish. The Church

of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Olivet, Bethany, the Jordan, Nazareth, and other sacred places are the shrines of Christendom. The Mosque of Omar, which occupies the area of the ancient temple in Jerusalem, the Mosque of Al-Aksa, Hebron, and other less conspicuous places are Mohammedan shrines. These shrines together command the reverence of eight hundred millions of Christians and Mohammedans. Would it be conducive to the peace of the world to put such holy places under Zionist control? Would that contribute to future Jewish tranquillity and happiness in the East?

Palestine is a small country which cannot possibly sustain comfortably, according to a decent standard of living, a much greater population than that which the natural increase of its present inhabitants will create. The expectation that such a strip of land can provide an outlet for the fourteen million Jews in the world and provide them with a "national home" is sheer folly. Those who know Palestine know this to be true.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The truth is that Palestine cannot support a large population in prosperity. It has a lean and niggardly soil. It is a land of rocky hills, upon which for many centuries a hardy people have survived only with difficulty by cultivating a few patches of soil here and there, with the olive, the fig, cirrus fruits, and the grape; or have barely sustained their flocks upon the sparse native vegetation. The streams are few and small, entirely insufficient for the great irrigation system that would be necessary for the general cultivation of the land. The underground sources of water can only be developed at a prodigious capital expense. There are thirteen million Jews in the world; the Zionist organization itself only claims for Palestine a maximum possible population of five millions. Even this claim is on the face of it an extravagant over-estimate. After careful study on the spot in Palestine, I prophesy

that it will not support more than one million additional inhabitants.

How under such circumstances can the people of Palestine be expected to acquiesce in a scheme which threatens to make the struggle for existence for them and their children so severe? The little country can be made to produce more than it now does, and that was what its present owners expected to do after their emancipation from Turkish rule. Like all forward-looking communities they had hoped that, as soon as the post-war conditions permitted, they themselves, with European expert aid, would give their country such a development, and not a host of foreign invaders. They were and are now willing to open their gates to normal immigration regulated by their National Government and the capacity of the country.

If the Zionist movement, which Mr. Morgenthau has characterized as " the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history," had the real promise of improving the lot of the oppressed Jews in the world, one would say that the protests of the people of Palestine might be ignored in favour of a scheme whose success would mean the solution of one of the world's greatest problems. But Zionism is a dream whose realization would only create another serious problem for Western Asia and a worse problem for the Jews. Ultimately the Jews themselves would have to pay the frightful cost of this aggression.

Those politicians, orators, and visionaries, who are far away from the scene and who risk nothing themselves in supporting Zionism but an effusion of words, should realize that it is a condition here and not a theory which we have to deal with. They should understand that Zionism as an ideal spiritual community is vastly different from Zionism as a scheme of political and economic conquest; that while the one is a state of mind which

concerns only those who believe in it, the other is an act of aggression against an innocent people, which threatens to fill the future with horror; that to support such a scheme of conquest does not mean to lessen, but to multiply, the miseries of the "oppressed Jews", and to compel the people of the Holy Land to expend in self-defence the powers and the treasures which they should expend in self-development.

THE PROPHET'S MATRIMONIAL CONNECTIONS

Two aspects of the Holy Prophet's most perfect, noble and examplary life have specially been selected by his traducers and detractors by misrepresenting which they have sought to defame and lower him in the estimation of the world. That the Prophet undertook all his expeditions to instil fear into the hearts of the non-Muslims and thus create a favourable atmosphere for the spread of Islam, is one of these two quite unscrupulous charges which we have proved again and again in the pages of the *Review of Religions* to be entirely unfounded and untenable.

The second accusation, perhaps, more heinous and diabolical as regards its insinuations and implications is that with the advance of the Prophet's years his lust and lasciviousness increased. The fact alone that the Prophet passed the best years of his life with a wife who was at least fifteen years older than him and that he did not marry any other woman even when that wife had reached the very advanced age of 60 and he himself was hale and hearty constitutes incontestible evidence of the accusation being devoid of all truth and reality.

It is true the Prophet married as many as 11 wives in his life-time and that he had 9 wives living at one time. But the mere fact that he had so many wives cannot and does not prove the charge that his enemies have laid at his door. If plurality of wives alone is to be the only criterion to test the moral condition of a man, many persons of proved purity of life, as many social and spiritual leaders and founders of religious systems to whom mankind owes a very deep debt of gratitude for all the moral and spiritual good that is found in the world to-day, will have to be regarded as sensual and lustful. The Prophet had acquired great prestige and power after his Flight to Medina.

Throughout Arabia he alone was the Head of a well-organized State, the Commander of a devoted and well-disciplined army, a powerful monarch, the Builder and Controller of the destinies of a whole people. He could if he would marry young girls of any age and belonging to any family. But he did not. Nay even at Mecca when the Quresh becoming despaired of the success of their cause against the Prophet offered to accept him as their king, to amass great wealth for him and even to give him in marriage the most handsome damsel in the whole of Arabia, he refused to be deflected from his divine course by such alluring temptations. How does it stand to reason then that a man who when he was comparatively much younger in years and more susceptible to carnal passions, should not at all hesitate to scornfully reject and spurn power, prestige, wealth and beautiful women to share his bed and who as the virtual ruler of a mighty state should prefer to select the widows of advanced age, as evidently the Holy Prophet did, for the gratification of his so-called carnal passions, should seek to satisfy his lust by marrying old women when he had grown old and his responsibilities and duties had very much increased. It is a queer sort of carnality which seeks gratification in marrying widows of advanced age alone. Did there ever live a lascivious person who like the Holy Prophet always married widows and led the most laborious, simple and frugal life? Could the Prophet afford to indulge in gaiety and light-hearted merry-making as his detractors try to depict him, in the last years of life when he was surrounded on all sides by enemies, when he had to manage the affairs of a State, had to lead his expeditions in person, had to educate and train his followers in the teaching, the diffusion and dissemination of which was the most sacred and pleasing mission of his life. Did he not spend his nights standing before his Creator praying, meditating, supplicating and imploring His forgiveness and mercy so much so that his feet used to get swollen? Was it not that for weeks and months together no fire could be lighted in his house, for there was nothing

to cook? Did he not himself sweep the house, milk the goats, mend his own clothes and cobble his own shoes? And all this when the financial condition of the Muslims had considerably improved. Did not the Prophet plainly tell his wives when they requested him to provide them with better amenities of life at a time when the Muslim community had grown generally prosperous and wealthy, to seek the vanities and splendours of life elsewhere as these things could not be allowed in his house? He could part with them, he said, if they liked, and they could get these things by marrying other Muslims. Did he not spend the last penny in his house in the way of God before he died? "Muhammad," he said, "would not meet his God by keeping filthy lucre in his house." Are these the ways of lustful and lascivious persons? Are sensualists and merry-makers made of such stuff? If Muhammad the Prophet of Arabia was a lustful man, the womb of woman has yet to give birth to a moral and pure son.

The Prophet had his purpose in marrying so many wives. He had a noble and sublime object in view. He knew he was the last law-bearing Prophet of God. He knew that all his actions and deeds, the minutest details of his life should be and would be copied and imitated by his followers. He knew that all his private and public acts were public property. He knew that God had sent him as an example and a model to be followed by mankind and he knew that his relations with his wives and the members of his household were as worthy of imitation and emulation as his relations with his friends and his enemies. So that the minutest details of how he behaved and what he did when he was screened from public gaze in the privacy of his *harem* should be preserved, he married more than one wife. That was one of the objects. He meant to teach and educate Muslim women and this he could not do without the medium of his wives in view of the restrictions of the *purdah* enjoined by the Quran. This was another object. Arabia was divided into many clans and tribes and houses.

These clans and families had their long-standing feuds and quarrels. There were quarrels of these clans with the house and the tribe to which the Prophet belonged. Having regard to the weakness of human nature and fearing lest after his death these old feuds should burst forth again he married women belonging to different houses to unite them by his personal link into one homogeneous community. These are but few of the reasons that led the Prophet to contract polygamous marriages. Besides this each marriage had its own particular reason.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

His Marriage with Zainab

We cannot enter into a detailed examination of all the reasons and causes that led to each one of the Prophet's marriages. His marriage with Zainab *bint* Jahsh having served as a pretext in the hands of the prejudiced Christian historians to malign and lampoon him, we briefly describe the causes that brought about this marriage. Zainab was Prophet's cousin. He wanted her to marry Zaid, his freed slave whom he loved as his own son. Zainab, though very pious and of an extremly God-fearing nature had this weakness that she regarded Zaid, an emancipated slave and a non-Qureshite, to be of too low social standing to be her husband. But she bowed before the wish of the Holy Prophet. She tried to pull on with Zaid peacefully and amicably. But her weakness was with her. Zaid on his side, too, was conscious of his inferiority of status. Zainab's idea of the superiority of her house coupled with Zaid's own painful consciousness of the inferiority of his status and standing took away much of that sweetness which is the natural result of a happy wedded life. Cordiality changed into coldness which in turn developed into estrangement. Zaid requested the Prophet to have the marriage dissolved. The Holy Prophet was naturally deeply pained as he of all persons was responsible for it. He had made an experiment by which he meant to demolish all false notions of the Arabs of their assumed

superiority over the non-Arabs, of the Quresh over the non-Quresh. That experiment had failed. He was perplexed. Zainab also felt humiliated as she had been divorced. The fault was as much of hers as that of Zaid. The Prophet was commanded by God to marry her. This latter marriage served a double purpose. Full compensation was made for Zainab's feeling of humiliation and a very prevalent but equally wrong idea that adopted sons were in all respects equal to real sons was for ever removed. The fact that Zainab was 35 years of age when the Prophet married her summarily dismisses the mischievous insinuation that captivated by the beauty of her person, he at first had her divorced by Zaid and then married her.

Ayesha's age at the time of her Marriage with the Prophet

It is not out of place here to say a word with regard to Ayesha's marriage with the Holy Prophet. Much misunderstanding prevails as to what was Ayesha's real age when she was married to the Prophet. One school of thought among the Muslims holds the view that Ayesha was only 9 when her marriage with the Prophet was consummated. This school bases their assumption on Ayesha's own statement recorded by the traditionist, Imam Bukhari, in the world-renowned collection of the Prophet's sayings which is known after his name. In the *Bukhari* at more than one place Ayesha is reported to have said that she was 6 years of age when she was betrothed to the Prophet, was 9 when her marriage took place, that she lived with the Prophet for 9 years and was 18 when the Prophet died. Another school observes that the date of her betrothal has been mistaken for her date of marriage. They believe that Ayesha was betrothed at the age of 9 and was married 5 years later when she was 14 years of age. The argument advanced by this school in support of their contention is that Ayesha before her betrothal to the Prophet was betrothed to Jabir, son of Mut'im. The inference is that if Ayesha was betrothed to the Prophet at

the age of 6 or 7, she must have been betrothed to Jabir when she was 4 or 5 years old and this is too tender an age for a girl to be betrothed. The exponents of this view also contend that according to Ayesha's own statement she remembered the time when the verse:

بل الساعة موعدهم والساعة آدهى وامر

"Nay, the hour is their promised time and the hour shall be most grievous and bitter" (54 : 46), was revealed and since Chapter 54, to which this verse belongs was revealed in the 6th year of the Call, Ayesha must have been at least 5 years old when the verse was revealed to be able to remember this fact. So they say that at the time of her *nikah* with the Prophet which took place in the month of *Shawwal* in the 10th year of the Call, she could not have been less than 9 years old. Without presuming to contradict this view we suggest that the exact date of the revelation of the above-mentioned verse is as wrapt in mystery as the age of Ayesha at the time of her marriage. The contention that a period of at least 1 or 2 years between Ayesha's betrothal to Jabir and the Prophet must have elapsed does not seem evidently to be very sound.

Our own view, however, about this controversial but nevertheless very important question is that Ayesha was ostensibly mistaken in calculating her age at the time of her marriage. An overwhelming majority of the historians accept the view that Ayesha was 7 years when she was betrothed to the Holy Prophet in the month of *Shawwal* in the 10th year of the Call. Some of them are undecided as to what exactly was her age at the time of her betrothal. They place it somewhere between 6 and 7. Even Ayesha herself thinks that she was 6 or 7 when she was betrothed. Ibn Hisham and the author of *Sirat Halbia* are definitely of the view that Ayesha was 7 at the time of her *nikah*. Ibn Sa'ad says in his *Tabaqat* كانت عائشه ولدت السنة الرابعة من النبوة فى اولها (*Tabaqat*, part 8, page 54) *i.e.* Ayesha was born in the beginning of the 4th year of the Call. Khaula *bint* Hakim's

suggestion that Ayesha should be betrothed to the Prophet inclines us to the view that not only was she 7 when betrothed but that her physical development was extraordinarily rapid. Had not even the great majority of the historians and traditionists been in favour of the 7 years' view, considering Khaula's suggestion alone we would have thought that she was even much older than 7. Anyhow taking into consideration all these different circumstances we are definitely of the view that Ayesha was almost 7 if not exactly 7 when her *nikah* ceremony was performed in the month of *Shawwal* in the 10th year of the Call. An overwhelming majority again of the historians – Zurqani, Aini, Khamis, being most prominent among them—believe that her marriage was consummated in *Shawwal* in the 2nd year of the Flight that is to say exactly 5 years after her *nikah*. This leads us to think that she was 12 when she was taken into his house by the Prophet. Considering the hot climate of Arabia in which girls acquire a tendency towards very early puberty and considering also the very rapid physical development of Ayesha, as is evident from the narrations quoted above, 12 years does not at all seem to be an unnatural age for the consummation of her marriage. By the way it might be remarked that Ibn Sa'ad places the consummation of Ayesha's marriage in the month of *Shawwal* in the first year of the Flight. But Ibn Sa'ad finds no corroboration and support from any source for his extraordinary view and the fact that he includes among his narrators *Waqdi* about whose unreliability and immaturity of views there is a general agreement among historians takes the ground from under Ibn Sa'ad's feet and demolishes his view-point.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DATES IN WORLD HISTORY

[The following Table of Dates has been taken from Mr. Cash's "The Expansion of Islam".—*Ed.*]

	ISLAM	EUROPE AND ASIA
A.D. 570-632	A.D. 570 Birth of The Prophet.	A.D.
Lifetime of the Prophet.	622 The Prophet's flight from Mecca. 623 Battle of Badr.	590 Gregory the Great sent missionaries to England. 597 St. Columba died. 590-628 Persian-Byzantine Wars. Chosroes II of Persia captured Jerusalem, Antioch, Egypt, and advanced to Bosphorus (615). Heraclius of Constantinople defeated Persians at Nineveh in 627.
	628 The Prophet sent letters to rulers of the earth.	628 Arab traders reached Canton; sent by the Prophet with a message to emperor to embrace Islam. The first mosque in China built.
	632 The Prophet died.	

N. B.—While Europe and Asia were locked in costly wars, the Prophet, in Arabia, was rising unnoticed, to power.

632-661		631 Nestorian missionaries from Persia arrive in China at the court of Tai-Tsung. 632-655 Marks period of rapid spread of Christianity in England.
First Moslem expansion. Arab rule with the empire capital at Medina. The first four Caliphs.	634 Battle of Yarmuk and defeat of Heraclius by Moslems. 637 Battle of Kadessia and defeat of Persians by Moslems. 638 Capture of Jerusalem. 655 Byzantine fleet defeated by Arabs off Alexandria. 656 Murder of Othman and end of Arab empire rule from Medina.	632 Conversion of East Angles. 634 Conversion of West Saxons. By 654 the Church established in nearly every English kingdom.

N. B.—This first period of Moslem expansion east and west coincided with Christian missionary enterprise as far as China to the east and England to the west.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

	ISLAM	EUROPE AND ASIA
A.D. 661-749 The Omayyad Dynasty at Damascus.	A.D.	A.D.
	668 Arabs overrun country from Tarsus to the Bosphorus. Attack on Constantinople.	664 Conference of Whitby and union of British and Roman branches of the Church in England.
	711 Moslem advance through Spain.	668 Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, and reorganization of the Church in England.
	715 Moslem empire extends from the Pyrenees to China.	
	718 Defeat of Moslems at Constantinople.	
		719 Boniface preaches Christianity in Germany.
	732 Defeat of Moslems at Pyrenees.	
	749 Beginning of break-up of the Moslem empire.	
	The first Moslem period coincided with the expansion of Christianity through England, and this second period marks the missionary efforts of the English Church through Europe.	
		755 Martydom of Boniface in Germany.
749-1258 The Abbaside Dynasty at Baghdad.	786 Haroun al-Raschid, Caliph at Baghdad, Ruler of the East. The Golden Age of the Abbasides. Renaissance in Islam.	
		800 Charlemagne, Emperor of the West, corresponds with Haroun al-Raschid.
		828 Egbert, first King of England.
		852 Boris, first Christian King of Bulgaria.
	865 Rival caliphs. Rise of anarchical sects. Heresies in Islam. Separation of distant parts of empire from Baghdad rule.	
	861-1258 Twenty-seven caliphs. Increasing power of Turkish mercenaries.	
		886 Alfred in England.
		1013 Canute, King of England.
	1031-1075 Rise of Seljuk Turks in Turkestan.	
		1066 The Norman Conquest.
		1096 First Crusade.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

A.D.	ISLAM	A.D.	EUROPE AND ASIA
			A.D.
			1187 Saladin captures Jerusalem.
			1204 Capture of Constantinople by Lalius.
			1214 Jenghiz Khan captures Peking.
			1221 Failure of Fifth Crusade.
			1240 Mongols destroy Kieff—Russia under Mongol rule.
		1258	Sack of Baghdad by Turks and murder of the Caliph.

This period, which marks the break-up of Abbaside rule in Islam, coincides with the early nationality movement in Europe. The glories of Baghdad in the East have their counterpart in the Holy Roman Empire in the West.

The Turks were rising to power at the same time as William was conquering England.

1258-1453 Islam under Turkish rule before fall of Constantinople.		1258-1295	Struggle of Seljuks against Ottoman Turks. Triumph of Ottomans.
			Europe now isolated from rest of world by Moslem supremacy in Mediterranean, Eastern Europe, Asia Minor and N. Africa.
			1271 Marco Polo starts upon his travels. Thirteenth to 14th century Renaissance in Europe. Beginnings of Reformation. Opening of new routes to Europe through world discoveries.
		1300-1335	Turkish attacks on Greek cities in Asia.
		1348	Marriage of Theodora, daughter of Emperor Cantacuzemus, to Turkish Sultan.
		1355	Turks cross Bosphorus.
		1361	Capture of Adrianople.
		1364	Conquest of Balkan States by Turkey.
			1378 Great schism in Church of Rome.
			1384 John Wyclif died.
			1398 John Huss at Prague.

A.D.	ISLAM	EUROPE AND ASIA
	A.D.	A.D.
	1402 Timur defeats Turks at Angora. Break-up of Turkish rule in Asia Minor.	
	1413 Revival of Turks.	
	1428 Capture of Salonika by Turks.	
	1444 Turkish war with Hungary.	
		1445 Discovery of Cape Verde by Portuguese.
	1453 Fall of Constantinople.	
	This period, which marks the zenith of Moslem power, the isolation of Europe and its danger from Turkish invasion, also reveals the beginnings of new forces. It is the dawn of the modern world.	
1453-1683	1451 Turkey prepares for conquest of Italy.	
		1486 Diaz rounds the Cape of Good Hope.
		1492 Columbus discovers America.
		1498 Vasco da Gama sails round the Cape of Good Hope to India.
Turkey from the capture of Constantinople to her defeat at Vienna.	1512 Sultan Salim assumes title of Caliph.	
		1517 Luther at Wittenberg.
		1519 Magellan's expedition begins voyage round the world.
	1520 Sulieman the Magnificent rules from Baghdad to Hungary.	
	1522 Capture of Rhodes by Moslems.	
	1525 Babar captures Delhi.	
		1527 German troops capture and pillage Rome.
	1529 Assault on Vienna.	
		1620 *Mayflower* and expedition to America.
		1649 The Commonwealth in England.
		1660 Charles II.
	1683 Defeat of Turkey at Vienna. The limit reached of Moslem expansion in Europe.	
	This period marks the decline of the Turks in their defeat at Vienna, the discoveries of the New World, the closing days of the feudal system, and the beginnings of democracy in Europe.	

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

A.D. 1683-1924

From the defeat at Vienna to 1924, showing the decline of Turkey.

ISLAM	EUROPE AND ASIA
A.D.	A.D.
This period marks the decline of Moslem power. For the next two centuries Islamic history is one of stagnation.	
1736 Turkish war with Russia and capture of Crimea.	
1739 Austria annexes Belgrade.	
1774 Moldavia and Wallachia placed under Russian protection.	
	1776 American Declaration of Independence.
	1789 Storming of the Bastille in Paris.
	1804 Bonaparte, Emperor—End of the dream of a new "Holy Roman Empire".
1829 Greece gains her independence.	
1831 Mohammed Ali of Egypt makes war on Turkey. Egypt semi-independent.	
	1832 Reform Bill in England and rise of democracy.
	1854 Crimean War. England, France and Turkey allied against Russia.
	1861 American Civil War.
1879 Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania declared independent.	
	1900 The Boxer Rising in China.
	1904-5 Russo-Japanese War.
	1909 M. Bleriot first to fly the English Channel in an aeroplane.
1911 Italy annexes Tripoli.	
	1912 China a Republic.
1913 Balkan War—Turkey in Europe further reduced.	
1918 Great War—Turkey loses Syria, Palestine, Arabia and Mesopotamia.	1914-1918 The Great War.
1924 Abolition of Caliphate and establishment of a Republic.	Republicanism in Europe.
The Moslem empire now reduced to Asia Minor and small strips of territory in Eastern Europe.	Nationality movements in East.
	Mandate system established for ex-enemy territory.
	League of Nations.
	Bolshevist movement in Russia.

This period, while showing decline in Moslem political power and the domination of the world by Europe, marks the limits of European expansion, as in Russo-Japanese War, and the rise of a new race-consciousness in the East.

NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN*

Introductory remarks with special reference to the verse, *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim.*

The Commandment to Seek Refuge with God Against the Devil

God says, "So, when thou recitest the Quran, say, I seek protection by Allah from the accursed Satan." (XVI, 99).

Where there is a treasure, there is the danger of thieves and robbers. As the Holy Quran is a precious treasure, and Satan being an enemy of man does not like that man should benefit by it and tries to steal it from the hearts which contain this treasure, therefore man is bidden to offer the aforesaid prayer in order to protect himself against his mischief.

It is in two ways that Satan works mischief :—

First, when a man turns to virtue, the evil spirits, seeing the strength of their party being weakened, try to prevent him from pursuing the course of righteousness and bring him back to their own party.

Secondly, the person who first turns to virtue afterwards becomes apathetic and indifferent with the result that his latter condition is worse than the former.

---

* Under this heading will continue to appear regularly in every issue of the *Review of Religions* explanatory notes on the Holy Quran. These "notes" will comprise translation and detailed and comprehensive explanation of the Quranic verses, beginning with Sura-tul-Fatihah and will be written by the famous writer and theologian, Maulana Sher Ali, B. A., aided and helped by the *dars* of the Quran which the present Head of the Ahmadiyya Community, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, has been giving from time to time at Qadian. In this way, we hope, by the grace of God, to bring out, in due course, a complete and exhaustive commentary of the Quran.—*Ed. R. R.*

Hence in order that man may protect himself against both these kinds of attacks, he has been taught to offer the aforesaid prayer so that Satan may neither put an obstacle in his way by means of evil spirits, nor estrange him from God and make him an object of His wrath by leading him to ingratitude and indifference to the truth.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The words of the prayer which we are asked to offer when beginning to read the Holy Quran are اعوذباللہ من الشیطن الرجیم (I seek protection by Allah from the accursed Satan). Now اعوذ is derived from عیاذ which means to have recourse to a person or thing for protection against the attack or injury of another person or thing. So اعوذ means 'I seek protection'. شیطان (*Shaitan*) means 'One far from the truth or one who removes a person away from the truth, or opposes the truth or is rebellious.'

رجیم means 'driven away, put at a distance, accursed, forsaken, ruined'. Thus, the prayer means, 'I fly to Allah and seek refuge with Him from a being who is removed from truth, puts men away from truth, opposes the truth and is driven away and cut off from communion with God?

The prayer also alludes to the fact that one should shun evil company, for friends and companions are affected by each other's sentiments and morals.

Names of the Opening Chapter

The Holy Prophet is reported to have given this Surah different names; *e.g.* 1. Sura-tul-Fatiha, 2. Fatiha-tul-Kitab, 3. Surah-tul-Hamd, 4. Ummul Kitab, 5. Ummul Quran, 6. Salat, 7. *As-sab'ul Mathani.*

This Surah being the opening Chapter of the Holy Quran is called *Suratul-Fatiha* or *Fatihatul-Kitab.* The word *Fatiha* signifies *opening.*

As the second verse of the chapter begins with the words *Al-hamdu-lillah* (all praise belongs to Allah), this Surah is also called *Suratul-Hamd* or the "Chapter of Praise".

The reason why this Surah is called *Ummul-Kitab* or *Ummul-Quran* is that the word *Umm* means 'origin' or 'root'. 'Mother' is also called *Umm* in Arabic, because she is the root from which her offspring originates. So this Surah is called *Ummul-Kitab* (the root of the book) or *Ummul-Quran* (the root of the Quran), because it is like a *'root'* to the rest of the Holy Quran. It comprises in itself all the subjects that have been discussed in the Holy Quran, so that it is, as it were, an epitome of the Holy Quran or its text while the rest of the Holy Quran forms the commentary or is an explanation of it, or in other words, it is like branches and leaves that have grown out of the root. As everything in this world has a root, so the word of God, *viz.*, the Holy Quran, has also a root, and that root is the first chapter of the Holy Quran. It is the nucleus out of which have grown all the parts of the tree.

The Place of the Revelation of the Surah

According to some, the Surah was revealed at Mecca, and according to others at Medinah. But the truth is that it was revealed both at Mecca and Medinah. As part of the subject matter of the Surah has a bearing on the Meccan life of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and part of it on his Medinite life, therefore it was first revealed at Mecca and then at Medinah. Thus it is both a Meccan and a Medinah Surah.

Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim

(*a*) This verse occurs in the beginning of every chapter of the Holy Quran. The only seeming exception is Chapter IX, but truly speaking, that also is no exception, for really Chapter IX is no separate chapter but only a part of the previous chapter (VIII).

There is a difference of opinion as to this verse being a part of the chapter to which it is prefixed. According to some, it is not the part of any Surah, according to others, it is part of the First Chapter only, and not of any other chapter; and there are others who hold it to be a part not only of the First Chapter, but of all the Surahs of the Holy Quran, and this is the correct view, for the following reasons:—

1. Abu Daood narrates the following tradition on the authority of Ibn-i-Abbas:—

"The Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him!) did not know that one Surah had ended and another had begun until the verse *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim* were revealed." This shows that the verse in question is a part of each Surah.

2. Anas says:—"The Holy Prophet said one day. A Surah has just been revealed and it runs thus:— In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. Truly, we have given thee abundant good.....(reciting Chapter CVIII to the end)", (*vide* Muslim and Abu Daood). This shows that the verse *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim* was revealed with each Surah just as other verses of the Surah were revealed and that it formed the first verse of every Surah.

Besides the above traditions which show that *Bismillah* formed part of the Quranic Surahs in general, the following traditions show that it formed part of the opening Surah in particular:—

1. Ummi Salmah, one of the wives of the Holy Prophet, is reported to have said that the Holy Prophet recited *Bismillah* in the beginning of Surah Fatiha in his prayer and counted it as one of its verses.

2. Abu Huraira says :—"The Holy Prophet said, when you recite *Al-Hamdulillah* (the first Chapter), read *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim*, for the chapter is *Ummul Quran* (the root of the Quran), *Sab'ul-Mathani* (the seven verses oft repeated), and *Ummul-Kitab* (the root of the Book), and *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim* is one of its verses. (Dar-ul-Qutni.)

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

3. Ibn-i-'Abbas says of those who do not look upon *Bismillah* to be a part of the opening Surah : "Satan has snatched from them the best of verses."

Another circumstance which shows that the verse beginning with *Bismillah* is a part of the opening chapter is that although in the time of Abu Bakr, Omar and Othman, the Holy Companions agreed not to include in the Holy Quran any word or words which did not form part of the original text, yet *Bismillah* was written in the beginning of every Surah. It was also proposed that the explanations of certain difficult passages given by the Holy Prophet might be committed to writing, and appended to the Holy Quran so that there might be no ambiguity as to the verses thus explained, but the idea was finally abandoned fearing lest such a course might lead to those explanations being confounded with the original text of the Holy Quran. This shows how jealously and scrupulously the Holy Companions guarded the Word of God , and if *Bismillah* had not formed part of the Word, they would never have allowed it to stand at the head of every Surah.

The reason why some men do not look upon *Bismillah* as the first verse of any Surah is that it is not recited aloud in prayers. But this is not right. Although certain traditions show that *Bismillah* should be recited in a low tone in prayers, yet there is no evidence to show that

it should not be recited at all. Abu Bakr, Omar and Othman used to recite *Bismillah* in a low tone along with *Suratul-Fatiha* and other Surahs in their prayers, while there were some companions who used to recite it aloud also. So those who do not hold *Bismillah* to be the part of any Surah on the ground that it is not recited aloud in prayers are mistaken.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The Repetition of *Bismillah* at the Beginning of the Surahs

(*b*) It has been asked why *Bismillah* is so often repeated and why it has been put in the beginning of every Surah. The answer to this question is that truly speaking there is no needless or useless repetition in the Holy Quran. No word, letter or vowel point has been used un-necessarily or without a purpose. Wherever there appears to be a repetition of verses or of incidents or of commandments, it is meant to serve a new purpose and new conclusions are sought to be drawn from it. It is for this reason that in the narration of historical events we find that certain portions of them have been mentioned at one place and omitted at another.

The repetition of *Bismillah* in the beginning of the Surahs follows the same rules. Every time it has been used with a new significance ; and it serves as a key to the contents of the chapter that follows.

Some are fond of brevity, while others are satisfied only when a thing is explained to them at full length. Similarly, in order to form a clear conception of a thing, sometimes it is necessary to view it as a whole on a small scale and sometimes to examine its separate parts in detail.

Again, in order to know the beauty or defectiveness of a thing, it is necessary both to view it in a magnified form and also to reduce it to small dimensions. So, in the case of the Holy Quran, we find that the contents of each Surah have been mirrored in the first verse, so that the first verse is, as it were, a miniature portrait of every following Surah.

To be more clear, all the knowledge and all the truths that have been revealed in the Holy Quran have their origin in the holy person of God and His exalted attributes and His excellent names, and all these attributes and names are comprehended in the two attributes *Ar-Rahman* and *Ar-Rahim* which are included in *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim*. Hence if there be any doubt as to the true significance of any verse, the best way to remove the doubt would be to compare our interpretation of the verse with the attributes of God. But if there be any doubt as to the true signification of an attribute of God, the correctness of the meaning which we ascribe to the attribute in question should be tested by comparing it with the significance of *Ar-Rahman* and *Ar-Rahim*. If that signification is in harmony with the sense of these two attributes, it should be accepted as correct, otherwise it should be rejected as erroneous. Similarly in order to have a vivid and clear conception of the attributes of *Ar-Rahman* and *Ar-Rahim*, one should ponder over the remaining attributes; and in order to know the full significance of the latter, one should study their exposition in the verses and Surahs of the Holy Quran. Thus, the verse *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim* coming in the beginning of each Surah serves as a key to its contents.

The Injunction to Recite *Bismillah* at the Commencement of an Important Work.

(*c*) The Holy Prophet enjoined his followers to recite *Bismillah* at the commencement of every work of importance. This injunction has a threefold purpose:—

First, by beginning our work in the name of Allah we invoke His blessings upon it.

Secondly, it is a prayer to God that He may, out of His mercy, provide means for the successful completion of the work and cause it to bear the best fruits.

Thirdly, we are herein taught that in everything we do our object should be to please God and to attain to His nearness and not to please others or to curry their favour.

The Holy Prophet said, "Every work of importance which is not begun with the name of Allah is devoid of good."

(*d*) *Bismillah* is a phrase consisting of three words: (1) *ba*, (2) *ism*, (3) *Allah*. *Ba* is a preposition signifying (1) 'with' (2) 'by means of'. Thus *Bismillah* means 'with the name of Allah' or 'by means of the name of Allah'. According to the rules of Arabic Grammar some word or words must be taken as understood before the said phrase. What those words are may be gathered from the first verse revealed to the Holy Prophet, *viz.*, 'Recite then in the name of thy Lord Who created.' (XCVI, 2). So the words 'I recite' or 'I begin' should be taken as understood before the words 'with the name of *Allah*'. *Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim* therefore means "I recite or I begin with the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful".

The Addition of the Word 'Name'

(*e*) The verse "I recite (or begin) with the name of Allah" is a prayer in which God's assistance and blessings are invoked. But the question is, why is the word 'name' added? Why is it said, I recite or begin, seeking the assistance and blessing of the *name* of *Allah*? Would it not be better to say, I recite or begin seeking the assistance and blessings of Allah? Why is the word "name" introduced?

The reply which grammarians give to this question is that the particle '*ba*' not only denotes the seeking of assistance but is also used for swearing. Hence, if instead of saying *Bismillah*, we should say, *Billah*, it might mean, 'I swear by God'. The introduction of the word *ism* (name) removes this ambiguity.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Prohibition in America

About 13 years ago by an Act of its Congress the United States of America prohibited to its inhabitants the use of alcohol in any shape or form. It was announced to the world, as if by beat of drum, that a Christian country had gone dry. It was believed at that time that many other western countries would soon follow America's noble example and some of them did actually give very serious consideration to this question. But before they could copy America in actual practice, there began to appear in America itself signs which showed unmistakably that this experiment, however, useful and laudable, was doomed to failure. Prohibition was believed to eradicate from the soil of America those abominable vices which generally follow in the wake of wine-drinking. But what actually happened was that Prohibition only did not completely fail to eradicate the contemplated vices, it really increased them and gave rise to many difficult and complicated problems into the bargain. Wine was as freely drunk as in pre-Prohibition days but only clandestinely. This led to boot-legging and illicit preparation of wine which in turn increased graft and corruption. As wine was smuggled into the country or was prepared secretly, it naturally, fetched very high prices. Business in secret preparation of wine flourished in the teeth of police vigilance which was either bought off or resisted by force. Gangs of proved bad characters were kept in service by smugglers, boot-leggers and distillers who were not prepared to give up their growing and progressive business at any cost. To be a ruffian and a dare-devil became a paying business. America attracted to its shores bad characters from all European capitals. One vice follows another. Kidnapping and murder became very common till President Hoover was compelled to confess that life and honour were more unsafe in America than in any other western country. The Police and the Judiciary of America are, by common consent, most corrupt and incompetent. And the failure of Prohibition has become so manifest that the Republicans who were its greatest protagonists have by a large majority voted for its abolition. This stupendous failure of a really grand and

noble experiment provides ample food for serious thought. A similar experiment was made by a 'Son of the Desert' fourteen hundred years back among a people who, judged by the western standards, were very primitive and still at the lowest rung of the ladder of civilization and culture. The Holy Prophet succeeded in enforcing total prohibition among his people without the aid and assistance of any police or military whereas America has failed with all its vaunts and boasts of polish and refinement. Is it because the Volstead Act was inflicted upon the American people quite against their consent and mental acquiescence and the Arabs, because they were convinced that the Prophet's injunctions and commandments were intended for their moral and spiritual benefit, most willingly submitted to them? Or is it because the morals of a whole nation cannot be reformed by acts of parliaments and only Prophets of God and not politicians and philosophers can bring about great upheavals in the social, moral and spiritual life of man?

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Christian testimony to the Catholicity of Islam

What better proof could be given of the catholicity and broad-mindedness of Islam and of the fact that it did not spread by the sword but by the noble example of its followers set in honesty, uprightness and clean living than that a dignitary of the Church of the learning, experience and social standing of Mr. Wilson Cash should bear witness to it. Islam's power, we have asserted again and again in the pages of the *Review of Religions* and we assert it here again with absolutely no fear of contradiction, has always been in the beauty and excellence of its teaching than in the swords and spears of its followers. Mr. Cash says in his well-known book, *The expansion of Islam* :

> "In the days of the early Caliphs there is no doubt that the Christians preferred Arab rule to that of Constantinople. Many too, digusted with the formalism and corruption within the Church, went over to Islam. When the Muslim armies reached the Jordon Valley the Christians wrote to them, saying :—
>
> 'O Muslims, we prefer you to the Byzantines, though they are of our faith, because you keep better faith with us and are more merciful to us and refrain from doing us injustice.'
>
> This attitude is typical of many areas invaded by Muhammadans. Support was certainly given to Islam by Copts in Egypt, by Nestorians in Mesopotamia, by the Christians in Eastern Europe

and by the slave classes in Spain. So deep was the hatred of the Byzantine rule that town after town opened its gates to the Arabs and made terms with them; in fact Heraclius would probably never have been driven out of Syria, certainly not so easily, had not the people of the country revolted and gone over to the Arab cause.....John was a great theologian of the Greek Church and at the Umayyad Court he held high office. It speaks eloquently for the tolerance of the Umayyad Caliphs that a Christian could not only be a favourite at Court but at the same time could write polemical treatises against Islam and in defence of Christianity. At the same Court the poet laureate was one Akhtal, who was also a Christian. Greek and Christian thought was excercising a profound influence upon the Muslim mind.....

Crusaders accept Islam

The noble character of Salah-ud-Din in the crusades and the misrule of the crusaders led many Christians of the Near East to prefer Muslim rule to that of their co-religionists, and after the victories of Salah-ud-Din Islam made great progress and the Church was further weakened. The remarkable thing is that when Christianity from the West, through the Crusaders, entered Palestine, Islam met this new element and without any sort of compulsion won over actual Crusaders themselves. During the first Crusade a body of Germans and Lombards abandoned their faith and embraced Islam. Nor was this the only incident, for in the second Crusade more than 3,000 Crusaders became Muslims. The story is told by the private Chaplin to Louis VII, who followed his master in the Crusade. The point he stresses is the cruelty of the Greeks to their fellow-Christians of the Latin faith. This, combined with the kind and generous treatment of the Saracens, won over this large body of men to Islam.....

Spread of Islam in Egypt

In Egypt Islam spread rapidly owing to the appalling lack of teaching by the Church. The spiritual and moral training of the people was neglected, the priesthood was ignorant and corrupt and religion became a formal affair of rites and ceremonies. In some parts of the Delta of Egypt the Christians were so completely neglected and denied the spiritual ministrations of the Church that practically the whole population became Muslim. As Arabic gradually supplanted Coptic and became the spoken language of the people, the Church steadily refused to face the facts of a new situation.....

Progress of Islam in Eastern Europe

Here the Muslims were as vigorous in their propaganda as the Christian Church was apathetic and indifferent. Many of the

clergy were ignorant men of little or no education. Moral life was at a low ebb and a dry rot seemed to have eaten into the foundations of the Church. By the seventeenth century large numbers of Albanians had for one cause or another forsaken the Church for Islam, and in one diocease we read that only two thousand Christians were left. The spread of Islam can be imagined from the fact that during the century from 1600 to 1700 a Christian body numbering ninety per cent. had been reduced to less than fifty per cent. Christian women freely married Muhammadans and their sons were always brought up as Muslims. The unpopularity of the clergy was largely responsible for this decline. Education was almost non-existent and the people knew little or nothing of the Christian faith. The quarrel between the Latin and the Greek Churches drove many over to Islam.

Modern Persia

In the decade preceding the Great War the political power of Islam was at its lowest ebb. It was generally believed in political circles in the west that in a few years Islam as a political power will altogether cease to exist. Turkey, the greatest Muslim power of the time was contemptuously nick-named as "the Sick-man of Europe" whose recovery from the many fatal social, economic and political diseases was considered quite impossible. Persia was divided into British and Russian spheres of influence. Afghanistan was only a stipendiary of the Indian Foreign Office. The Great War weakened still more the already hopelessly weak political power of Islam. Turkey was completely disintegrated and there were no signs visible of any improvement in the political conditions in other Muslim countries when all of a sudden, quite contrary to all forecasts and expectations, these countries became conscious of their growing degradation and seriously set about to free themselves from the yoke of foreign domination. Turkey became free under Mustafa Kamal. Persia regained her full-fledged independence under the distinguished leadership of Riza Shah. Aman Ullah Khan raised Afghanistan from the position of a mere dependent principality into a powerful state whose alliance was eagerly sought, and Arabia, from the thick gloom of obscurity into which it had remained wrapped for the last 1300 years, came once again into the lime-light and was successful in getting itself recognized as a strong and independent country. On the ruins and ashes, as it were, of the political power of Islam there has come into being a very strong and well-built edifice. Once again the truth of the saying

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

اسلام زندہ ہوتا ہے ہر کربلا کے بعد *i.e.*, "Islam revives and resuscitates with added strength after going through every fiery ordeal resembling the agony of Karbala." And now great reforms are being carried out in every Muslim country. Regarding Persia "the *International Review of Missions* says :—

> Similarly, the compulsory teaching of Persian as the medium of instruction contributes to the same end and the unification of dialects into a national language is a great asset in the proclamation of the Gospel. The same forces that have levelled distinctions in dress, race and rank have helped in abolishing fanaticism and creating an open mind. Allied to this is the great increase in educational opportunity. The educational budget has grown in ten years from £23,000 to £841,000. There are primary schools in every village of any size, and middle schools in all towns; the Government aims at free primary education for every boy, and is making rapid strides towards the goal. Ultimately education may be made compulsory. Schools for girls are increasing; there are seventy-six more than there were three years ago. In consequence, the reading constituency has greatly widened.

There has been considerable progress in improving the position of women in Persia :

> The Government has taken steps to secure greater freedom for women, and women themselves are more ready to challenge custom or laws that bear hardly on their sex. The compulsory use of the veil has been abandoned in the large towns, and polygamy, concubinage and child marriage are challenged with increasing frankness. One of the most widely discussed bills of recent years contained drastic praposals for the revision of the marriage and divorce laws. It was originally proposed that the minimum age for marriage should be sixteen for women and eighteen for men. (The present average age for marriage for women is thirteen.) While clerical opposition in the end prevented the fixing of an age limit, penalties were imposed for marriage before maturity. Wives were permitted to dispose of their own property, and a Moslem woman was absolutely forbidden to marry a non-Moslem man. The provisions of this law reflect the varied influences playing on national life.

> The Government's attitude towards religion is not very active. It curbed the influence of the *mullahs*, and by so doing has indirectly encouraged the people in their rebellion against the former autocracy of the religious leaders, who had steadily opposed all movements for reform. The educated classes have long ceased to have any respect for their clergy. The Government, however, was not prepared to abolish religion altogether. It insists on the Koran and the Islamic law being taught in all schools, though mission schools are not required to have these subjects taught in class. Religious

liberty, while not proclaimed as a law, is largely in practice a recongnized principle. During this decade one convert was exiled for public confession of Christianity, but this was at the beginning of the period, and would probably not take place to-day. Altogether the political changes in Persia have tended towards more freedom of thought and less bigotry, and there has been secured a fairer hearing for the Christian Message than it had in former years.

What ails Modern Civilization

The wide-spread economic depression that has over-whelmed the whole world is engaging the attention of all seriously-minded people. In a well-informed article on the present economic situation, the *Nation* observes :

> As most people realize, the main result of this steady catering to the producer at the consumer's expense has been an immense concentration of wealth in the hands of a small industro-financial group, chiefly composed of rather ill-educated men, commonplace in most things except an overdeveloped instinct of acquisition. I do not propose to belittle the intelligence of readers by dwelling on the disadvantages of concentrated wealth. I do want to say, however, that the chief objection to it is not that it makes a few people extremely rich and a great many extremely poor. That is certainly an objection. But unfortunately it cuts deeper than that. For in a civilization like ours wealth is merely another name for power over every phase and function of society. And when this sort of power is narrowly massed, it is dangerous. For it is almost sure to be used to control politics, fill the press with propaganda, and muddy the sources of public opinion to a degree that nearly disfranchises the electorate. Religion will not be true to itself if it fails to deal adequately with these vitai problems of modern civilazation. A spirituality which is totally indifferent to such important concerns of life might have had a fascination for mediæval asceticism but it will assuredly lose all its influence on the minds of the present-day man who is more or less seriously affected by the economic forces working around him. A church that seeks to be liberal and up-to-date must make a determined effort to disseminate, among its people, higher and nobler ideals of social equity and justice. It must organize public opinion and make it strong enough to counteract the evil effects of capitalism.

We fully agree with the *Nation* that "religion will not be true to itself if it fails to deal adequately with these vital problems of modern civilization". But if the *Nation* thinks that Christianity can even imperfectly deal with these problems it is doomed to sad disappointment. Christianity offers no code of economic and social laws. Its whole teaching is summed up in the "Sermon on the

Mount". That Sermon gives no guidance to man in his every-day life. To Islam belongs the credit of laying a detailed programme for man to follow in the minutest particular of his life. Those who sincerely desire to know how Islam adequately and effectively deals with the vital problems of modern civilization should read that masterly book, *The True Islam*, by the present Head of the Ahmadiyya community, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad.

India in British Parliament

A single Bill providing alike for provincial autonomy and for All-India Federation and a continuation of the co-operation between British and Indian representatives were announced by Sir Samuel Hoare, the Secretary of State for India, in making his eagerly awaited statement on the future constitutional programme in the House of Commons on 27th June when the India Office vote was debated. The following are the main points made by Sir Samuel Hoare :—

His Majesty's Government have definitely decided to endeavour to give effect to their policy by a single Bill providing alike for autonomous constitutions in the Provinces and for a federation of the Provinces and the States but the Provinces will not have to wait until all the necessary steps for federation are completed.

These steps, however, will be expedited as much as possible.

His Majesty's Government wishes to retain the advantage of consultation and co-operation, but are convinced that matters have now reached a stage where the settlement of the urgent, important questions still outstanding will only be delayed by formal sessions of large bodies like the Round Table Conference or the Federal Structure Committee.

The Government are engaged in deciding the terms of the communal settlement, which will be announced some time this summer.

The Consultative Committee will then meet and meanwhile His Majesty's Government are considering means for a speedy solution of problems affecting the States alone.

In the hope that the Consultative Committee will leave few questions for settlement the Government proposes thereafter to

invite both Houses of Parliament to set up before the introduction of any Bill a Joint Select Committee with power to confer with representatives of Indian opinion on definite proposals for legislation.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

If, however, the Consultative Committee does not appear to advance its work to a stage when definite proposals can be formulated His Majesty's Government will arrange for further consultation of a more formal character.

Sir Samuel Hoare added :—" By procedure framed on these lines His Majesty's Government hope to ensure both rapid progress towards the objective in view and a continuance of co-operation between British and Indian representatives on the one hand and between the three British Parties on the other, on which so much of the success of the constitutional changes must inevitably depend."

A plea for separate electorates

Mr. Muhammad Monir, M.A., LL. B., has contributed a very learned and forceful article to the *Civil & Military Gazette*, Lahore which has appeared in its issues of 17th and 18th June. We take the following from that article :

The retention of the existing system of communal representation and further extension of the principle underlying it is, in some quarters, suggested as a workable alternative and there is no doubt that the Mohamadan community tenaciously clings to this system. Communal representation in the form in which we have it to-day is unknown to history, though the principle on which the system is based is very well recognised in democracy. Separate electorates with reserved seats were introduced in India as a form of minority protection because of the peculiar circumstances obtaining here. They have been most adversely criticised, and have often been described as being responsible for the widespread communal feeling of the present day. On a closer observation, however, it will be found that the institution of separate electorates is neither so senseless nor mischievous as it is often made out to be; as separate electorates, with seats reserved on a population basis, are the logical result of the combined operation of the principle of universal suffrage and proportional representation—principles which form the basis of most of the representative governments of the day. If adult

suffrage is adopted to-day and elections are held by the method of proportional representation it is clear, to everyone who would care to work out a somewhat complicated question in arithmetic that the result is the same as when seats are fixed for the various communities on a population basis. It is true that in the system of proportional representation there is *ex facie* a mixed constituency, but in fact and in theory each party has in that system a clearly separate constituency.

Separate electorates with seats reserved on a population basis are not therefore so clear a heresy from the representative principle as one at the first sight would believe them to be. The real difficulty in the Indian problem is not the recognition of communal parties but the formation of parties on a communal basis. So long as parties are formed among the electors on a communal basis, it is contrary to principle not to recognize party formation on such lines in the legislatures. The candidate who in a mixed constituency is elected to the legislature on a communal ticket is not true to his constituency if he ceases to be a communalist when he actually takes his seat in the legislature. On the other hand, a separate constituency may be said to have this advantage, that the contest being among the members of the same community, it makes voting on other than purely communal lines not only possible but inevitable. I must not, however, be taken either as eulogizing or condemning separate constituencies, as I am writing this article from a purely scientific point of view, my object being to examine the application of the principles and practice of Western democracy to Indian conditions. I have tried to show that it is wrong to charge those who first conceived of this novel device of separate electorates with perpetuating communalism, as it is the Indian voter who is really responsible for the formation of parties on a communal basis.

Communalism is another name for formation of parties on a religious basis and it is wrong to suppose that party formation on a religious basis is unknown to democracy. The Catholics in Germany, the workers and peasants in Poland, the Conservatives in Czechoslovakia, the Jews in the Baltic States, and the Bosnian and South Serbian Mussalmans in Yogoslavia form parties on a definitely religious basis. Again party formation on a racial or lingual basis is fairly common in post-war States in Europe and

there is no distinction between the formation of parties on a racial or lingual basis, as racial or lingual parties agree in all their essential characteristics with parties formed on a religious basis. The fundamental distinction between parties formed on purely political questions and those formed on a religious, racial, or lingual basis is that whereas the former are not permanent, the latter are. Where parties are formed on broad questions of Home or foreign policy, the minority of to-day can hope to become the majority of to-morrow, but nothing of the kind can be expected where electors array themselves in religious, racial, or lingual groups, for the obvious reason that men do not so easily change, if they change at all, their religion, race or language as they change their political creed.

The real question therefore is whether democracy, which mainly depends for its results on the existence of two or more parties, the relative strength of which is constantly changing, is suitable to a country where parties are formed on a constant and not on a shifting basis. The answer to this question must of course be in the negative. Formation of parties on any but a purely political basis must stereotype institutions and render political growth and development slow and difficult if not actually impossible. The real task for the Indian patriot therefore is to bring into existence parties formed on a national as distinguished from a communal basis.

One who thinks that in the present state of political education in India parties can be formed on a national basis, irrespective of communal considerations, and that India can with advantage work a democratic constitution of the normal type is like a fool who starts building a castle by laying its foundations in the air. Democracy is another name for majority rule and where a communal majority is invested with plenary power, the result is the worst form of government which can befall a rival minority. Contemporary history offers no sanction to this kind of majority rule and the constitution maker who in his fondness for the democratic form overlooks this aspect of the matter virtually makes democracy an instrument of legalized oppression.

Communalism is certainly the strongest argument against, and the most formidable impediment to, democracy, but have we not ourselves provided the basis for this argument and created this impediment ? In our discussions on the form of the constitution

which India should have we take it for granted that we are possessed of that degree of national solidarity which is a pre-requisite for true democracy. The assumption is, however, fundamentally wrong as India still lacks the natural and essential characteristics of a nation and it is only for people united by a common bond of nationhood that democracy holds a promise of progress and prosperity. Any scheme of government based on the assumption that there exists in India at the present time a nation is foredoomed to failure.

How the Moors were Expelled from Spain

Islam still continues to be regarded, in some Christian and Hindu circles, as intolerant, illiberal and bigoted inspite of overwhelming authentic historical evidence to the contrary. Whether Islam is or is not intolerant (we most emphatically believe it is not and it has irrefutably been proved that it is not), the intolerance and narrow-mindedness in matters religious displayed by Christian monarchs and acknowledged and respected leaders of the Christian Church have seldom been approached and will, perhaps, never be surpassed. The account of the expulsion of the Moors from Spain by a Christian Monarch who was looked upon in Christian circles to be unusually pious and religious is so shocking and heart-breaking that a person whose heart is not totally devoid of the feelings of compassion and mercy cannot help shedding tears on reading it. A Christian king could only be capable of such heartless treatment. In his *History of the Saracens* the late Syed Amir Ali says:

> Neither the pious Ferdinand nor the saintly Isabella meant to abide by the capitulation concluded with the Muslims, who were soon reminded of the ominous warning of their last hero by the fate of the Jews. These people had prospered under the tolerant rule of the Saracens; their wealth attracted the cupidity of the Castilian sovereigns. In 1492 A. C., Ferdinand, who always concealed his perfidious policy in the cloak of religion, and lavished promises where he meant to deceive, promulgated a decree that they should either abandon their religion or leave the country. They were burnt, tortured, or exiled. Simultaneously with the decree against the Jews, the terms settled with the Muslims began to be infringed; they were subjected to every humiliation and injury; their religion and laws were proscribed, and many of them were forcibly baptized. The treachery of the Castilians caused great resentment among the Muslim population, and the Albaezin rose in arms, which only led to further ill-treatment. In 1498 A. C. the ferocious Ximenes started a universal persecution. They were enjoined within a certain time to embrace "the religion of the idolators" or to submit to death. Some yielded, but a majority clung to their faith and be took themselves to the mountains of Alpuxarras. Here they were attacked by the persecutors. Not

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

content with massacring the men, the Castillians blew up by gunpowder a mosque where the women and children of a wide district had taken refuge. In spite of the odds against them the Muslims defended themselves bravely, and in 1501 A. C. gained a victory at Jabal Balansa, which obtained for the survivors and their families an exit to Morocco, Turkey and Egypt. Their goods and chattels, however, were seized by their Christian majesties. Those that remained and they were still numerous, were compelled at the point of sword to make a profession of Christianity. Although nominally Christians, " they were not so in their hearts, for they worshipped God in secret, and performed their prayers and ablutions at the proper hours ". " They took care to wash off the holy water with which their children were baptized as soon as they were out of the priest's sight ; they came home from their Christian weddings to be married again after the Muhammadan rite. A wise and honest government, respecting its pledges given at the surrender of Granada, would have been spared the danger of this hidden disaffection, but the rulers of Spain were neither wise nor honest in their dealings with the Moriscoes, and as time went on they became more and more cruel and false. These nominal Christians were watched with the greatest vigilance, and any sign of backsliding brought upon the hapless offender the punishment of Inquisition. The fires of the *auto da fe* were lighted at Granada, at Cordova, and at Seville, and from day to day the flames devoured numbers of men, women, and children. In order to prevent a rising the use of every sharp instrument, even to the smallest knife, was interdicted and so the unlucky descendants of the race that had conqured Spain bore patiently the tortures and outrages to which they were subjected. In 1568 A. C. their condition became intolerable. Not satisfied with despoiling their victims of property and privileges, reducing them to a hideous servitude in the land where they had once reigned, the Christian sought their extermination—the destruction of the very memory of their glorious existence. The mad fanatic Philip II occupied the throne of Spain at this time. And the Archbishop of Granada, equally ferocious and fanatical, obtained from him a decree requiring Arabs to abandon their language, their customs, their manners, and all their institutions in a day. The infidels were ordered to abandon their picturesque costume, and to assume tie, hats and breeches of the Christians ; to give up bathing, and adopt the dirt of their conquerors, to renounce their language, their customs and ceremonies, even their very names, and to speak Spanish, behave Spanishly, and re-name themselves Spaniards. The wholesale denationalization of the people was more than any folk, much less the descendants of the Almanzors and the Abencerrages, could stomack. Driven to desperation they rose in arms. It was a hopeless struggle. After three years of incessant fighting the insurrection was crushed by the notorious Don Juan of Austria, by wholesale butchery and devastation. Men and women and children were butchered under his own eyes, and the villages and the valleys of the Alpuxarras were turned into human shambles. The poor people who took refuge in caves were smoked to death. There still remained a large number of Moriscoes, as they were called, in Valencia and Murcia. In 1610 A. C. Philip III completed the work begun by his father ; over half a million of inoffensive people were forcibly deported to Africa and thrown upon its shores without any means or money. Those who lived in the interior, and whose number is said to have amounted to no less than two hundred thousand, unhappy remnant of a once powerful and prosperous nation were mercilessly driven across the frontier into France, whence such as survived the cruelties of the Spaniards or the hardships of the road, took ship to the countries of Islam. From the fall of Granada to the reign of Philip III three millions of people were driven out of the Peninsula !

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The Ahmadiyya Movement

THE Ahmadiyya Movement was founded by Hazrat Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi and the expected Messenger of all nations. In the spirit and power of all the earlier prophets he came to serve and reinterpret the final and eternal teachings laid down by God in the Holy Quran. The Movement therefore represents the true and real Islam and seeks to uplift humanity and establish peace throughout the world. Hazrat Ahmad died in 1908, and the present Head of the Movement is his second successor, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, under whose direction the Movement has established Missions in many parts of the world, the following being the addresses of some of them :—

(1) THE LONDON MOSQUE, 63, Melrose Road,
Southfields, London, S. W. 18, England.

(2) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM,
Sufi M. R. Bengalee, M.A.,
56 E, Congress St., Suite 1307,
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. America.

(3) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Commercial Road, Salt Pond,
Gold Coast, West Africa.

(4) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Rose Hill, Mauritius.

(5) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
25-27, Alof Street, Okepopo, Lagos,
Nigeria, W. Africa.

(6) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Box No. 305, G. P. O.
Perth, W. Australia.

(7) THE CENTRAL (E.A.) AHMADIYYA
MUSLIM ASSOCIATION,
P. O. Box No. 554, Nairobi
(Kenya Colony).

(8) MAULVI ABUL 'ATA, Maulvi Fazil,
Sharial Burj, Haifa, Palestine.

(9) MAULVI RAHMAT ALI, Oetœsan Ahmadiah,
Defensielijn V/d Bosch, No. 139, Batavia Centrum, Java.

(10) MAULVI MOHD. SADIQ, H.A., Oetœsan Ahmadiah,
Padang—(Sumatra).

Regd. No. L.-2942

— THE —

REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(A MONTHLY JOURNAL)

OF SANE RELIGIOUS MUSLIM THOUGHT

DEVOTED TO

THE DIFFUSION AND DISSEMINATION

OF

THE BEAUTIES AND EXCELLENCES

OF

ISLAMIC TEACHING & TORCH-BEARER

OF

THE LIGHT OF ISLAM IN THE WEST.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Gives an Impartial Review of the Prominent Religions of the World and Removes Misconceptions about ISLAM.

Annual Subscription . ... Rs. 4

All remittances should be sent to the MANAGER,

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS (English)

P. O. Qadian, Punjab (India)

Printed at the Ripon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore, by Mirza Mohd. Sadiq, and published by Sheikh Abdur Rahman Qadiani for Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Qadian, Punjab, India.